

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.2048 of 2015

Date of Decision.09.02.2015

Gagandeep Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. P.S. Jammu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-. -

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner has an objection as an aspirant for an allotment that the allotment made to the 3rd respondent was wrong. According to her, the property which is offered by the 3rd respondent for allotment of a LPG godown is a piece of land which has no access for allowing for vehicles to go. The petitioner would state that if there is a private land in the case of a private road connecting the public road, the same shall also belong to the family of the applicant as per the ownership criteria referred to above.

2. The right of access to a property can be verified on personal inspection and if the 3rd respondent was providing for a property and if the authorities have satisfied themselves that the right for access is available, that should conclude the matter between the parties. It cannot be a matter of intervention by the Court that a property shown for allotment is property without any access. Private rights created for

access would not be reflected in the revenue records and the reference to revenue records that the adjacent owners did not provide for access cannot be considered in writ petition by this Court.

3. I find no cause for intervention. The writ petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

February 09, 2015
Pankaj*